APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/624,445	07/22/2003	Alan Cox	0113715.00134US1	6446

68998 7590 10/26/2007	EXAMINER
WILMERHALE / RED HAT, INC.	PATEL, ASHOKKUMAR B

WILMERHALE / RED HAT, INC.
60 STATE STREET
BOSTON, MA 02109

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/26/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

P

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/624,445	COX, ALAN
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ashok B. Patel	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 August 2007</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1,4-7 and 9-17</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>2,3,8, and 18-30</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-30 are subject to examination. Claims 1, 4-7 and 9-17 have been

cancelled.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 07/31/2006 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive for the following reasons:

<u>Applicant's Argument No. 1:</u>

        "At paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 2, 3, 8 and 18-

30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

In particular, the Examiner asserts that the specification of this application does not

contain subject matter to implement the limitation, <u>"notifying the at least one other</u>

<u>approver of a changed status for the electronic message."</u> The Applicant traverses this

rejection. The Applicant believes that the specification supports this limitation.

        FIGs. 2A and 3A show the information presented to an approver. (paragraphs

[0032], [0050]). The information presented to the approver is updated when an

electronic message is approved. (paragraph [0044]). Once the approvers' devices are

synchronized, all of the approvers are presented with the same information. (paragraph

[0028]). Therefore, when one approver approves an electronic message, the other

approver is notified of the approval by the fact that the electronic message is shown as

moved from the unapproved folder to the approved folder. For the example given in the

specification, the messages 230a and 230b are in the unapproved folder prior to

approval in FIG. 2A, and are in the approved folder after approval in FIG. 2B.

(paragraph [0044]). Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection

is improper and should be withdrawn. Claims 18 and 26 should be allowable. Since

claims 2, 3, 8 and 19-25 depend from allowable claim 18, and claims 27-30 depend

from allowable claim 26, those claims should also be allowable."

Argument No. 2

The Applicant disagrees that the "semantic engine" of Mastrianni is an approver

as recited in claims 18 and 26. Claims 18 and 26 both recite, "presenting the electronic

message on a display to at least one of the approvers for approval or rejection."

Because of this requirement, the semantic engine cannot be one of the approvers

recited in claims 18 and 26, since the semantic engine of Mastrianni cannot be

presented with the electronic message on a display.

"Mastrianni clearly does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 18

and 26, since the semantic engine is not a human approver. Further, Mastrianni does

not teach sending the message in question to an approver prior to being routed to the

user or sent to the intended recipient.

Examiner's response to Applicant's Argument No. 1:

A.   First, Examiner would like to present the history of prosecution in its own

chronological order as follows:

a.   In response to claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Lu (US 2002/0107950 A1) in view of Bulfer at al. (hereinafter

Bulfer) (US 2006/0036701 A1), and further in view of Sherman et al (hereinafter

Sherman)(US 2002/0194177 A1)   stated in the Non-Final Office Action dated

03/27/2006, the Applicant's response dated 07/31/2006 presented the following arguments, which are copied here for presentation as they were:

"A careful reading of Sherman reveals that it does not teach or suggest updating a display according to a changed status for an electronic message. The description from Sherman that the Examiner cites is directed only to folders, and not to the e-mail messages or other information structures stored within the folders. The thrust of the Sherman reference in general, and of the text the Examiner cites in particular, is synchronization and other processing as applied to folders and subfolders, but not to the messages residing within those folders.

Sherman pointedly does not apply the synchronization processes it teaches to e-mail messages. Notice that Sherman does not ignore the subject of e-mail messages - rather, Sherman describes e-mail messages in peripheral contexts, unrelated to the synchronization that is the focus of the patent (see, for example, paragraph [0026]). In fact, Sherman teaches that the synchronization concepts it describes may be applied in other contexts, such as to file directories, task categories, notes, contacts and other categories of information (see paragraph [0077], but Sherman pointedly excludes e-mail messages."

b. Examiner then responded with the Final Office Action, dated 10/13/2006 with the following response along with the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lu (US 2002/0107950 A1) in view of Bulfer at al. (hereinafter Bulfer) (US 2006/0036701 A1), and further in view of

Sherman et al (hereinafter Sherman)(US 2002/0194177 A1), which are copied here

for presentation as they were:

"In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one

cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections

are based on combinations of references.   See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208

USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir.

1986).

Sherman teaches at para. [0011], "The intuitive characteristic of the invention's

selective synchronization process can be applied to a wide variety of synchronizable

information. One aspect of the invention includes applying the selective synchronization

process to an e-mail folder hierarchy. The subsets of the e-mail folder hierarchy are

synchronized between computing systems, such as a server and a client or

"companion" device. Predetermined user actions that implicitly demonstrate the user's

desire to synchronize particular folders of the hierarchy are defined, and when the user

performs one of these predetermined actions, those particular folders are flagged as

part of the subset of folders to be synchronized between the server and client. In this

manner, only the folder subset that is determined by one of these actions to be of

interest to the user, rather than the entire folder hierarchy, is synchronized. This is

accomplished without requiring the user's explicit identification of the subset of folders to

be synchronized."

Thus Sherman does teach synchronization and other processing as applied to

folders and subfolders of an email folder.

As indicated clearly below, and in the previous office action, this teachings of Sherman is combined with the teaching of "Approval Folder" of Bulfer."

c.   In response to the Final Office Action dated 10/13/2006, the Applicants responded with the following after final amendment of the claims 18 and 26 in question, which are copied here for presentation as they were:

"18. (Currently amended) A method for operating an electronic messaging system comprising:

routing an electronic message intended for a first user to at least two approvers, wherein each of the at least two approvers can approve or reject the electronic message;

presenting the electronic message on a display to at least one of the approvers for approval or rejection;

determining whether the electronic message is approved or rejected by applying a predetermined policy toward approval or rejection actions by the at least one of the approvers presented with the electronic message;

routing the electronic message to the first user if the electronic message is approved; and once the electronic message is approved or rejected by one approver, updating a display notifying the at least one other approver according to of a changed status for the electronic message.

26. (Currently amended) A method for operating an electronic messaging system comprising:

directing an outgoing electronic message having an intended recipient sent by a first user to at least two approvers, <u>wherein each of the at least two approvers can approve or reject the electronic message</u>;

presenting the electronic message on a display to at least one of the approvers for approval or rejection;

determining whether the electronic message is approved or rejected by applying a predetermined policy toward approval or rejection actions by the at least one of the approvers presented with the electronic message;

routing the electronic message to the recipient if the electronic message is approved; and once the electronic message is approved or rejected by one approver, ~~updating a display for~~ notifying the at least one other approver ~~according to~~ <u>of</u> a changed status for the electronic message."

d.   Examiner responded by issuing an Advisory Action and the Applicant subsequently filed "Request for Continued Examination." With the above claim amendments as shown in "c."

e. Examiner issued Non-Final Office Action dated 05/01/2007 with the following "Response to Arguments" and rejections, which are copied here for presentation as they were:

"Response to Argument

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2, 3, 8 and 18-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, however, Examiner would like to request to consider the teachings of the following prior arts since these

prior arts teach "routing an electronic message intended for a first user to at least two

approvers, wherein each of the at least two approvers can approve or reject the

electronic message" and more in relation to the claimed limitations of claims 18 and 26.

>   a. LU US 2002/0107950

>   b. Gatz et al. (US 2002/0049806 A1)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of
> making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the
> art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall
> set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5.   Claims 2, 3, 8 and 18-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as

failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject

matter, which was not described in the specification of this application under

examination in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art to

use and/or make the invention.

Referring to claim 18,

The specification of this application under examination does not contain subject

matter to implement limitations, "notifying the at least one other approver of a changed

status for the electronic message.", as cited in Claim 18. Examiner has reviewed the

specification of this application under examination and could not find support for the

additional limitations as claimed.

Examiner is interpreting this limitation as "sending any kind of indication of the

rejection or approval."

Referring to claims 2, 3 and 19-24,

Claims 2, 3 and 19-24 are rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 18 as above, because of their dependency on claim 18.

Referring to claim 26,

The specification of this application under examination does not contain subject matter to implement limitations, "notifying the at least one other approver of a changed status for the electronic message.", as cited in Claim 26. Examiner has reviewed the specification of this application under examination and could not find support for the additional limitations as claimed.

Examiner is interpreting this limitation as "sending any kind of indication of the rejection or approval."

Referring to claims 8 and 27-30,

Claims 8 and 27-30 are rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 26 as above, because of their dependency on claim 26.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless-

> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6.   Claims 2, 3, 8 and 18-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Mastrianni (US 2002/0116641 A1)."

B.   Second, Now that we have looked at the history of the prosecution, the

above Applicant's Argument No. 1 is presented in response to the Non-Final

Office Action dated 05/01/2007 of "c." above.

As noted by the Applicant, "notifying the at least one other approver of a changed

status for the electronic message." is nothing but "The information presented to the

approver is updated when an electronic message is approved. (paragraph [0044]).

Once the approvers' devices are synchronized, all of the approvers are presented with

the same information. (paragraph [0028]). Therefore, when one approver approves an

electronic message, the other approver is notified of the approval by the fact that the

electronic message is shown as moved from the unapproved folder to the approved

folder."

C.   Third, these arguments that are presented in the above paragraph "B.",

was argued by the Applicant in response to the Non-Final Office Action dated

03/27/2006 and Final Office Action dated 10/13/2006 providing the claim rejections

based on the same reasoning.

D.   Examiner's response to Applicant's Argument No. 2:

Therefore, the following new rejection is being provided in response to the

amended claims providing the methodology as presented in <u>Applicant's Argument No. 1</u>

, "The information presented to the approver is updated when an electronic message is

approved. (paragraph [0044]). Once the approvers' devices are synchronized, all of the

approvers are presented with the same information. (paragraph [0028]). Therefore,

when one approver approves an electronic message, the other approver is notified of

the approval by the fact that the electronic message is shown as moved from the

unapproved folder to the approved folder. ", with the following remarks:

Claims 18 and 26 does have any indication of any kind of "folder(s)".

"It is the claims that define the claimed invention, and it is claims, not

specifications that are anticipated or unpatentable. *Constant v. Advanced Micro-*

***Devices Inc.*, 7 USPQ2d 1064."**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section

102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that

the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having

ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in

which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 2, 3,8 and 18-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Lu (US 2002/0107950 A1) in view of Bulfer at al. (hereinafter Bulfer)

(US 2006/0036701 A1), and further in view of Sherman et al (hereinafter Sherman)(US

2002/0194177 A1)

Referring to claim 18,

Lu teaches a method for operating an electronic messaging system (Fig. 1a)

comprising:

routing an electronic message intended for a first user (Fig. 1a, element 150) to at least two human approvers, wherein each of the at least two human approvers can approve or reject the electronic message prior to the electronic message being routed to the first user (Fig. 1a, element 160, page 2, para.[0021]," Furthermore, an electronic message may be directed to one or more supervisory recipients 160.");

presenting the electronic message to at least one of the approvers for approval or rejection (Abstract," A message screening system includes routing to a supervisory recipient an electronic message directed to an intended recipient. The supervisory recipient then is allowed to screen the electronic message by approving or rejecting the electronic message. The electronic message then is forwarded to the intended recipient if the electronic message is approved by the supervisory recipient.")

determining whether the electronic message is approved or rejected by applying a predetermined policy toward approval or rejection actions by the at least one of the approvers presented with the electronic message; routing the electronic message to the first user if the electronic message is approved (page 2, para.[0023], "The message screening system may be configured to automatically screen an electronic message. For example, lists of approved or blocked senders 110 may be stored at supervisory recipient 160, or otherwise, to enable automatic screening of predesignated message types or sender identifications. In one implementation, during the screening process, the sender 110 may be added to the lists of approved or blocked senders by the supervisory recipient 160. In another implementation, the MS server 140 may compare the electronic address of sender 110 to the list of approved or blocked senders 110 and,

based on the comparison, either forward the message, reject the message, or allow supervisory recipient 160 to screen this message of senders 110 personally, or otherwise. <u>Approval may include a manual procedure performed by supervisory recipient 160 such as entering a command or pressing a key.</u> Approval also may be a default condition that is presumed to exist after a certain time period of inaction by supervisory recipient 160 after receiving the electronic message. In general, MS server 140 generally forwards the electronic message to intended recipient 150.")

Although Lu <u>clearly</u> teaches at page 2, para.[0016], "For example, intended and supervisory recipients 150, 160 may include personal computer systems or other electronic devices such as a pager, a personal digital assistant, or a wireless telephone for communicating electronic messages.", and at page 2, para.[0022] "Supervisory recipient 160 may be provided with a viewing screen having one or more control panels that allow supervisory recipient to approve or reject the electronic message for receipt by intended recipient 150.",and [0023]," <u>Approval may include a manual procedure performed by supervisory recipient 160 such as entering a command or pressing a key.</u>", Lu is silent in "presenting a message in Approval folder" and "once the electronic message is approved or rejected by one approver, notifying the at least one other approver of a changed status for the electronic message."

Bulfer teaches in Fig. 3 and at para.[0025]," The screen further includes a series of checkboxes 204, for example, for enabling processing of the EPC message. In an exemplary embodiment, the EPC screen display 200 include a delete message box 204a, an EPC box 204b, and an approve box 204c. By activating the delete box 204a,

e.g., checking the box, the message will be deleted. Checking the approve box 204c results in the message being forwarded to the child client inbox 112 (FIG. 2), and checking the EPC box 204b results in the sender becoming an approved sender contained in the EPC list 114 (FIG. 2)." And also Bulfer teaches that the messages for approval be delivered to "Approval Folder", Fig. 2, element 124. ("presenting a message in Approval folder"").

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply "display depicting approval folder" (Fig. 3) of Bulfer to the teachings of Lu such that a screen display enables the parents to individually (one or more supervisory recipients 160) bring up the "approval folder" by choosing the folder to open and approve messages and/or senders and then the processed messages are forwarded to the E-mail client so that approved messages can be accessed by the child and approved senders can be added to the control list.

However, both references, Lu and Bulfer fail to teach "once the electronic message is approved or rejected by one approver, notifying the at least one other approver of a changed status for the electronic message."

Sherman teaches in Fig. 8A and 8B and para.[0059], viewing of listing of messages by folders. Also Sherman teaches the subfolder synchronization at para.[0065]. Also Sherman teaches that synchronization can be between server and any of the user devices at Fig. 4 at folder or subfolder level of the any of the folder level as depicted in Fig. 5. Sherman teaches at para.[0045]," The folder hierarchy illustrated in FIG. 5 represents a typical hierarchy that is created by the user on a server or

desktop computer. When the user connects <u>a companion device (such as an H/PC) to</u> <u>the server or desktop computer, a subset or the entire set of folders may be</u> <u>synchronized between the two systems. In order to identify which folders are to be</u> <u>synchronized, a flag or electronic code is set on a parent folder.</u> That is, an "expanded" flag, which is set on a folder, pertains to the subfolder list of that folder and means that its subfolders will be synchronized. In this manner, the subfolders themselves are not necessarily individually marked in any way.", and at para.[0075]," <u>In another example, a</u> <u>user may be provided with a GUI screen or other UI methodology to explicitly select</u> <u>subfolders that are to be excluded from the synchronization process."</u>(notifying the at least one other approver of a changed status for the electronic message.")

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the 'folder" and/or "subfolder level" synchronization" for the mail objects on user owned PC and its companion devices (<u>a</u> <u>companion device (such as an H/PC) to the server or desktop computer, a subset or the</u> <u>entire set of folders may be synchronized between the two systems. In order to identify</u> <u>which folders are to be synchronized, a flag or electronic code is set on a parent folder.</u>) to the combined teachings of Lu and Bulfer such that the only required "folder" or "subfolder", such as Bulfer's "approval folder", can be synchronized among the various approval display devices used by more than one parent recipients of Lu.

The advantage is that one parent would immediately know what the other parent approved thereby not repeating the approval action.

Referring to claims 19 and 20,

Although Lu teaches (page 2, para.[0021]," Furthermore, an electronic message

may be directed to <u>one or more supervisory recipients 160.</u>")(two approvers to approve

or reject the electronic messages). Lu also teaches at para. [0006], "In some

implementations, a supervisory recipient may be designated for an intended recipient.

For example, the intended recipient may be a minor child and the supervisory recipient

may be a guardian for the minor child. <u>The intended recipient and the supervisory</u>

<u>recipient may have related accounts within an electronic mail service.</u> Additionally, the

intended recipient and the supervisory recipient may have unique screen names

comprising a single Internet service provider account. Alternatively, the intended

recipient and the supervisory recipient may have unrelated accounts.", Lu fails to teach

the method of claim 18, wherein, in accordance with the predetermined policy, the

electronic message is approved or rejected when either one of the at least two

approvers first approves or rejects the electronic message and wherein, once the

electronic message is approved or rejected by either one of the at least two approvers,

the other at least one approver will no longer be presented with the electronic message.

Bulfer teaches in Fig. 3 and at para.[0025]," The screen further includes a series

of checkboxes 204, for example, for enabling processing of the EPC message. In an

exemplary embodiment, the EPC screen display 200 include a delete message box

204a, an EPC box 204b, and an approve box 204c. By activating the delete box 204a,

e.g., checking the box, the message will be deleted. Checking the approve box 204c

results in the message being forwarded to the child client inbox 112 (FIG. 2), and

checking the EPC box 204b results in the sender becoming an approved sender

contained in the EPC list 114 (FIG. 2)." And also Bulfer teaches that the messages for approval be delivered to "Approval Folder", Fig. 2, element 124.

Additionally Bulfer teaches at para. [0008], While the invention is primarily shown and described in conjunction with Internet E-mail **accounts for parents** and children, it is understood that the invention is applicable to message systems in general, such as wireless messaging and voice mail systems, in which it is desired for a supervisory user to filter incoming messages for a supervised user." (in accordance with the predetermined policy, the electronic message is approved or rejected when either one of the at least two approvers first approves or rejects the electronic message and wherein, once the electronic message is approved or rejected by either one of the at least two approvers, the other at least one approver will no longer be presented with the electronic message.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply "account for parents" and "presenting a message in Approval folder" of Bulfer to the teachings of Lu such that a screen display enables any one of the parents (account for parents) to bring up the "approval folder" by choosing the folder to open and approve messages and/or senders and then the processed messages are forwarded to the E-mail client so that approved messages can be accessed by the child and approved senders can be added to the control list.

Referring to claim 21

Although Lu teaches (page 2, para.[0021]," Furthermore, an electronic message may be directed to one or more supervisory recipients 160.")(two approvers to approve

or reject the electronic messages). Lu also teaches at para. [0006], "In some

implementations, a supervisory recipient may be designated for an intended recipient.

For example, the intended recipient may be a minor child and the supervisory recipient

may be a guardian for the minor child. The intended recipient and the supervisory

recipient may have related accounts within an electronic mail service. Additionally, the

intended recipient and the supervisory recipient may have unique screen names

comprising a single Internet service provider account. Alternatively, the intended

recipient and the supervisory recipient may have unrelated accounts.", and at page 2,

para.[0022] and [0023]," Approval may include a manual procedure performed by

supervisory recipient 160 such as entering a command or pressing a key." Lu fails to

teach method of claim 18, wherein, in accordance with the predetermined policy, the

electronic message is approved when both of the at least two approvers approve the

electronic message, and rejected when either one of the at least two approvers rejects

the electronic message.

Bulfer teaches in Fig. 3 and at para.[0025]," The screen further includes a series

of checkboxes 204, for example, for enabling processing of the EPC message. In an

exemplary embodiment, the EPC screen display 200 include a delete message box

204a, an EPC box 204b, and an approve box 204c. By activating the delete box 204a,

e.g., checking the box, the message will be deleted. Checking the approve box 204c

results in the message being forwarded to the child client inbox 112 (FIG. 2), and

checking the EPC box 204b results in the sender becoming an approved sender

contained in the EPC list 114 (FIG. 2)." And also Bulfer teaches that the messages for

approval be delivered to "Approval Folder", Fig. 2, element 124. Additionally Bulfer

teaches at para. [0008], While the invention is primarily shown and described in

conjunction with Internet E-mail accounts for parents and children, it is understood that

the invention is applicable to message systems in general, such as wireless messaging

and voice mail systems, in which it is desired for a supervisory user to filter incoming

messages for a supervised user." (rejected when either one of the at least two

approvers rejects the electronic message.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of "approval folder" and

"presenting a message in Approval folder" of Bulfer to the teachings of Lu such that a

screen display enables either both the parents or any one of the parents depending

upon the set up of their email accounts, as suggested by Lu, to bring up the "approval

folder" by choosing the folder to open and approve or reject messages and/or senders

wherein message screening can be conducted by either both the parents or any one of

the parents depending upon the set of their email accounts (wherein, in accordance with

the predetermined policy, the electronic message is approved when both of the at least

two approvers approve the electronic message, and rejected when either one of the at

least two approvers rejects the electronic message) and then the processed messages

are forwarded to the E-mail client so that approved messages can be accessed by the

child and approved senders can be added to the control list.

Referring to claim 22,

Although Lu teaches (page 2, para.[0021]," Furthermore, an electronic message may be directed to <u>one or more supervisory recipients</u> 160.")(wherein the electronic message is routed to the at least two approvers). Lu also teaches at para. [0006], "In some implementations, a supervisory recipient may be designated for an intended recipient. For example, the intended recipient may be a minor child and the supervisory recipient may be a guardian for the minor child. The intended recipient and the supervisory recipient may have related accounts within an electronic mail service. <u>Additionally, the intended recipient and the supervisory recipient may have unique screen names comprising a single Internet service provider account.</u> Alternatively, the intended recipient and the supervisory recipient may have unrelated accounts.", and at page 2, para.[0022] and [0023]," Approval may include a manual procedure performed by supervisory recipient 160 such as entering a command or pressing a key." And accessible by the at least two approvers from multiple devices at multiple locations. (para.[0016]).

Lu fails to teach "<u>message is being routed to a single folder</u>.

Bulfer teaches in Fig. 3 and at para.[0025]," The screen further includes a series of checkboxes 204, for example, for enabling processing of the EPC message. In an exemplary embodiment, the EPC screen display 200 include a delete message box 204a, an EPC box 204b, and an approve box 204c. By activating the delete box 204a, e.g., checking the box, the message will be deleted. Checking the approve box 204c results in the message being forwarded to the child client inbox 112 (FIG. 2), and checking the EPC box 204b results in the sender becoming an approved sender

contained in the EPC list 114 (FIG. 2)." And also Bulfer teaches that the messages for approval be delivered to "Approval Folder", Fig. 2, element 124. Additionally Bulfer teaches at para. [0008], While the invention is primarily shown and described in conjunction with Internet <u>E-mail accounts for parents and children,</u> it is understood that the invention is applicable to message systems in general, such as wireless messaging and voice mail systems, in which it is desired for a supervisory user to filter incoming messages for a supervised user." ("message is being routed to a single folder.")

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of apply "account for parents", "approval folder" and "presenting a message in Approval folder" of Bulfer to the teachings of Lu such that a screen display enables either both the parents or any one of the parents depending upon the set of their email accounts, as suggested by Lu, to bring up the "approval folder" by choosing the folder to open and approve or reject messages and/or senders wherein message screening can be conducted by either both the parents or any one of the parents depending upon the set of their email accounts and then the processed messages are forwarded to the E-mail client so that approved messages can be accessed by the child and approved senders can be added to the control list.

Referring to claim 23,

Lu teaches the method of claim 18, wherein the electronic message is routed to the first user upon by being routed to a folder, accessible by the first user from multiple devices at multiple locations. (para. [0016] and [0017])

Referring to claim 24,

Lu teaches the method of claim 18, wherein the electronic message is deleted

upon rejection in accordance with the predetermined policy (para. [0021]).

Referring to claim 25,

Lu teaches the method of claim 18, wherein the electronic message is archived

at a location that is inaccessible to the first user upon rejection in accordance with the

predetermined policy (para. [0021]).

Referring to claims 2 and 3,

Lu teaches the method of claim 4418, further comprising applying a filter to the

electronic message, such that the electronic message is approved if the electronic

message passes the filter, and the method of claim 4418, further comprising applying

filter to the electronic message, such that the electronic message is rejected if the

electronic message passes the filter. (para.[0022]-[0024])

Referring to claim 8,

Lu teaches the method of claim -1-524, further comprising, if delivery of the

electronic message to the intended recipient is approved, sending a notification to the

first user. (para. [0021])

Referring to claim 26,

Lu teaches a method for operating an electronic messaging system (Fig. 1a)

comprising:

directing an electronic message to at least two human approvers, wherein each

of the at least two human approvers can approve or reject the electronic message (page

2, para.[0021]," Furthermore, an electronic message may be directed to <u>one or more</u>

<u>supervisory recipients 160</u>.");

presenting the electronic message to at least one of the approvers for approval

or rejection (Abstract," A message screening system includes routing to a supervisory

recipient an electronic message directed to an intended recipient. The supervisory

recipient then is allowed to screen the electronic message by approving or rejecting the

electronic message. The electronic message then is forwarded to the intended recipient

if the electronic message is approved by the supervisory recipient.")

determining whether the electronic message is approved or rejected by applying

a predetermined policy toward approval or rejection actions by the at least one of the

approvers presented with the electronic message; routing the electronic message to the

first user if the electronic message is approved (page 2, para.[0023], "The message

screening system may be configured to automatically screen an electronic message.

For example, lists of approved or blocked senders 110 may be stored at supervisory

recipient 160, or otherwise, to enable automatic screening of predesignated message

types or sender identifications. In one implementation, during the screening process,

the sender 110 may be added to the lists of approved or blocked senders by the

supervisory recipient 160. In another implementation, the MS server 140 may compare

the electronic address of sender 110 to the list of approved or blocked senders 110 and,

based on the comparison, either forward the message, reject the message, or allow

supervisory recipient 160 to screen this message of senders 110 personally, or

otherwise. Approval may include a manual procedure performed by supervisory

recipient 160 such as entering a command or pressing a key. Approval also may be a

default condition that is presumed to exist after a certain time period of inaction by

supervisory recipient 160 after receiving the electronic message. In general, MS server

140 generally forwards the electronic message to intended recipient 150.")and

Although Lu clearly teaches at page 2, para.[0016], "or example, intended and

supervisory recipients 150, 160 may include personal computer systems or other

electronic devices such as a pager, a personal digital assistant, or a wireless telephone

for communicating electronic messages.", and at page 2, para.[0022] and [0023],"

Approval may include a manual procedure performed by supervisory recipient 160 such

as entering a command or pressing a key." Lu is silent in "presenting a message in

Approval folder", directing an outgoing electronic message having an intended recipient

sent by a first user to at least two approvers prior to the electronic message being

routed to the intended recipient " and "once the electronic message is approved or

rejected by one approver, notifying the at least one other approver of a changed status

for the electronic message."

Bulfer teaches in Fig. 3 and at para.[0025]," The screen further includes a series

of checkboxes 204, for example, for enabling processing of the EPC message. In an

exemplary embodiment, the EPC screen display 200 include a delete message box

204a, an EPC box 204b, and an approve box 204c. By activating the delete box 204a,

e.g., checking the box, the message will be deleted. Checking the approve box 204c

results in the message being forwarded to the child client inbox 112 (FIG. 2), and

checking the EPC box 204b results in the sender becoming an approved sender

contained in the EPC list 114 (FIG. 2)." And also Bulfer teaches that the messages for approval be delivered to "Approval Folder", Fig. 2, element 124. Additionally Bulfer teaches at para. [0008], While the invention is primarily shown and described in conjunction with Internet E-mail accounts for parents and children, it is understood that the invention is applicable to message systems in general, such as wireless messaging and voice mail systems, in which it is desired for a supervisory user to filter incoming messages for a supervised user." ("presenting a message in Approval folder" to at least one of the approvers for approval or rejection"). Bulfer also teaches at para.[0023]," It is understood that the "reply to" field can be examined in addition to the sender field."(directing an outgoing electronic message having an intended recipient prior to the electronic message being routed to the intended recipient)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of apply "account for parents", "approval folder", "presenting a message in Approval folder" and "examining reply to filed" of Bulfer to the teachings of Lu such that a screen display enables either both the parents or any one of the parents depending upon the set of their email accounts, as suggested by Lu, to bring up the "approval folder" by choosing the folder to open and approve or reject messages and/or senders wherein message screening can be conducted by either both the parents or any one of the parents depending upon the set of their email accounts and then the processed messages are forwarded to the E-mail client so that approved messages can be accessed by the child and approved senders

can be added to the control list and the approved messages can be sent by the child

after examining "reply to" addresses which can also be added to the control list.

However, both references, Lu and Bulfer fail to teach "once the electronic

message is approved or rejected by one approver, notifying the at least one other

approver of a changed status for the electronic message."

Sherman teaches in Fig. 8A and 8B and para.[0059], viewing of listing of

messages by folders. Also Sherman teaches the subfolder synchronization at

para.[0065]. Also Sherman teaches that synchronization can be between server and

any of the user devices at Fig. 4 at folder or subfolder level of the any of the folder level

as depicted in Fig. 5. Sherman teaches at para.[0045]," The folder hierarchy illustrated

in FIG. 5 represents a typical hierarchy that is created by the user on a server or

desktop computer. When the user connects a companion device (such as an H/PC) to

the server or desktop computer, a subset or the entire set of folders may be

synchronized between the two systems. In order to identify which folders are to be

synchronized, a flag or electronic code is set on a parent folder. That is, an "expanded"

flag, which is set on a folder, pertains to the subfolder list of that folder and means that

its subfolders will be synchronized. In this manner, the subfolders themselves are not

necessarily individually marked in any way.", and at para.[0075]," In another example, a

user may be provided with a GUI screen or other UI methodology to explicitly select

subfolders that are to be excluded from the synchronization process."(updating a

display according to a changed status for the electronic message.")

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the "folder" and/or "subfolder level" synchronization" for the mail objects on user owned PC and its companion devices (a companion device (such as an H/PC) to the server or desktop computer, a subset or the entire set of folders may be synchronized between the two systems. In order to identify which folders are to be synchronized, a flag or electronic code is set on a parent folder.) to the combined teachings of Lu and Bulfer such that the displays of the only required "folder" or "subfolder", such as Bulfer's "approval folder", can be synchronized among the various approval display devices used by more than one parent recipients of Lu.

The advantage is that one parent would immediately know what the other parent approved thereby not repeating the approval action.

Referring to claims 27 and 28,

Although Lu teaches (page 2, para.[0021]," Furthermore, an electronic message may be directed to one or more supervisory recipients 160.")(two approvers to approve or reject the electronic messages). Lu also teaches at para. [0006], "In some implementations; a supervisory recipient may be designated for an intended recipient. For example, the intended recipient may be a minor child and the supervisory recipient may be a guardian for the minor child. The intended recipient and the supervisory recipient may have related accounts within an electronic mail service. Additionally, the intended recipient and the supervisory recipient may have unique screen names comprising a single Internet service provider account. Alternatively, the intended recipient and the supervisory recipient may have unrelated accounts.", Lu fails to teach

the method of claim 26, wherein, in accordance with the predetermined policy, the electronic message is approved or rejected when either one of the at least two approvers first approves or rejects the electronic message and wherein, once the electronic message is approved or rejected by either one of the at least two approvers, the other at least one approver will no longer be presented with the electronic message.

Bulfer teaches in Fig. 3 and at para.[0025]," The screen further includes a series of checkboxes 204, for example, for enabling processing of the EPC message. In an exemplary embodiment, the EPC screen display 200 include a delete message box 204a, an EPC box 204b, and an approve box 204c. By activating the delete box 204a, e.g., checking the box, the message will be deleted. Checking the approve box 204c results in the message being forwarded to the child client inbox 112 (FIG. 2), and checking the EPC box 204b results in the sender becoming an approved sender contained in the EPC list 114 (FIG. 2)." And also Bulfer teaches that the messages for approval be delivered to "Approval Folder", Fig. 2, element 124.

Additionally Bulfer teaches at para. [0008], While the invention is primarily shown and described in conjunction with Internet E-mail **accounts for parents** and children, it is understood that the invention is applicable to message systems in general, such as wireless messaging and voice mail systems, in which it is desired for a supervisory user to filter incoming messages for a supervised user." (in accordance with the predetermined policy, the electronic message is approved or rejected when either one of the at least two approvers first approves or rejects the electronic message and wherein, once the electronic message is approved or rejected by either one of the at

least two approvers, the other at least one approver will no longer be presented with the electronic message.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply "account for parents" and "presenting a message in Approval folder" of Bulfer to the teachings of Lu such that a screen display enables any one of the parents (account for parents) to bring up the "approval folder" by choosing the folder to open and approve messages and/or senders and then the processed messages are forwarded to the E-mail client so that approved messages can be accessed by the child and approved senders can be added to the control list.

Referring to claim 29,

Although Lu teaches (page 2, para.[0021]," Furthermore, an electronic message may be directed to <u>one or more supervisory recipients</u> 160.")(two approvers to approve or reject the electronic messages). Lu also teaches at para. [0006], "In some implementations, a supervisory recipient may be designated for an intended recipient. For example, the intended recipient may be a minor child and the supervisory recipient may be a guardian for the minor child. The intended recipient and the supervisory recipient may have related accounts within an electronic mail service. <u>Additionally, the intended recipient and the supervisory recipient may have unique screen names comprising a single Internet service provider account.</u> Alternatively, the intended recipient and the supervisory recipient may have unrelated accounts.", and at page 2, para.[0022] and [0023]," Approval may include a manual procedure performed by supervisory recipient 160 such as entering a command or pressing a key." Lu fails to

teach method of claim 26, wherein, in accordance with the predetermined policy, the electronic message is approved when both of the at least <u>two</u> approvers approve it, and rejected when either one of the at least two approvers rejects the electronic message.

Bulfer teaches in Fig. 3 and at para.[0025]," The screen further includes a series of checkboxes 204, for example, for enabling processing of the EPC message. In an exemplary embodiment, the EPC screen display 200 include a delete message box 204a, an EPC box 204b, and an approve box 204c. By activating the delete box 204a, e.g., checking the box, the message will be deleted. Checking the approve box 204c results in the message being forwarded to the child client inbox 112 (FIG. 2), and checking the EPC box 204b results in the sender becoming an approved sender contained in the EPC list 114 (FIG. 2)." And also Bulfer teaches that the messages for approval be delivered to "Approval Folder", Fig. 2, element 124. Additionally Bulfer teaches at para. [0008], While the invention is primarily shown and described in conjunction with Internet <u>E-mail accounts for parents and children,</u> it is understood that the invention is applicable to message systems in general, such as wireless messaging and voice mail systems, in which it is desired for a supervisory user to filter incoming messages for a supervised user." (rejected when either one of the at least two approvers rejects the electronic message.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of "approval folder" and "presenting a message in Approval folder" of Bulfer to the teachings of Lu such that a screen display enables either both the parents or any one of the parents depending

upon the set up of their email accounts, as suggested by Lu, to bring up the "approval

folder" by choosing the folder to open and approve or reject messages and/or senders

wherein message screening can be conducted by either both the parents or any one of

the parents depending upon the set of their email accounts (wherein, in accordance with

the predetermined policy, the electronic message is approved when both of the at least

two approvers approve it, and rejected when either one of the at least two approvers

rejects the electronic message) and then the processed messages are forwarded to the

E-mail client so that approved messages can be accessed by the child and approved

senders can be added to the control list.

Referring to claim 30,

Although Lu teaches (page 2, para.[0021]," Furthermore, an electronic message

may be directed to <u>one or more supervisory recipients</u> 160.")(wherein the electronic

message is routed to the at least two approvers). Lu also teaches at para. [0006], "In

some implementations, a supervisory recipient may be designated for an intended

recipient. For example, the intended recipient may be a minor child and the supervisory

recipient may be a guardian for the minor child. The intended recipient and the

supervisory recipient may have related accounts within an electronic mail service.

<u>Additionally, the intended recipient and the supervisory recipient may have unique</u>

<u>screen names comprising a single Internet service provider account.</u> Alternatively, the

intended recipient and the supervisory recipient may have unrelated accounts.", and at

page 2, para.[0022] and [0023]," Approval may include a manual procedure performed

by supervisory recipient 160 such as entering a command or pressing a key." And

accessible by the at least two approvers from multiple devices at multiple locations. (para.[0016]).

Lu fails to teach "message is being routed to a single folder.

Bulfer teaches in Fig. 3 and at para.[0025]," The screen further includes a series of checkboxes 204, for example, for enabling processing of the EPC message. In an exemplary embodiment, the EPC screen display 200 include a delete message box 204a, an EPC box 204b, and an approve box 204c. By activating the delete box 204a, e.g., checking the box, the message will be deleted. Checking the approve box 204c results in the message being forwarded to the child client inbox 112 (FIG. 2), and checking the EPC box 204b results in the sender becoming an approved sender contained in the EPC list 114 (FIG. 2)." And also Bulfer teaches that the messages for approval be delivered to "Approval Folder", Fig. 2, element 124. Additionally Bulfer teaches at para. [0008], While the invention is primarily shown and described in conjunction with Internet E-mail accounts for parents and children, it is understood that the invention is applicable to message systems in general, such as wireless messaging and voice mail systems, in which it is desired for a supervisory user to filter incoming messages for a supervised user." ("message is being routed to a single folder.")

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of apply "account for parents", "approval folder" and "presenting a message in Approval folder" of Bulfer to the teachings of Lu such that a screen display enables either both the parents or any one of the parents depending upon the set of their email accounts, as suggested by Lu, to

bring up the "approval folder" by choosing the folder to open and approve or reject

messages and/or senders wherein message screening can be conducted by either

both the parents or any one of the parents depending upon the set of their email

accounts and then the processed messages are forwarded to the E-mail client so that

approved messages can be accessed by the child and approved senders can be added

to the control list.

Conclusion

Examiner's note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the

references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are

applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures

may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses,

to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the

claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or

disclosed by the Examiner.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Ashok B. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-

3972. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 am-4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Nathan A. Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ashok B. Patel
Examiner
AU2154